

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 ANKARA 003740

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, NP/RA, NP/MNA, AC/ISN, VC/FO, EUR/SE;
GENEVA FOR AMB. SANDERS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 06/30/2029

TAGS: [PARM](#) [KNNP](#) [MNUC](#) [PREL](#) [TU](#) [IR](#)

SUBJECT: PSI AND NPT: TURKS "DEEPLY DISAPPOINTED" AT LACK
OF U.S. RESPONSE ON PSI CORE GROUP; AGREE NEED TO KEEP
PRESSURE ON IRAN

REF: A. STATE 142212

[B](#). STATE 139286

[C](#). ANKARA 3117

Classified By: DCM ROBERT S. DEUTSCH, REASONS 1.4 B AND D.

[1](#). (C) Action Request at Para 8.

Summary

[2](#). (C) While delivering Refs A and B, PolMilCouns and PolMilOff were treated to an unexpected and emotional reaction to U/S Bolton's PSI letter from usually stoic MFA Director General for Disarmament and Security Affairs Haluk Ilicak. On NPT PrepCom III views, Ilicak said he would circulate Ref B to relevant authorities for considered comments, but as an initial point he said that Turkey, too, was very concerned about states seeking to develop a nuclear capability, especially Iran. He contended that we needed to keep pressure on Iran and to prepare the ground in the UNSC before having IAEA refer Iran's case there. A UNSCR would be difficult to pass due to Russian assistance to Iran's program development, non-aligned states supporting one of their own, and EU members seeking to protect their commercial interests. On PSI, Ilicak repeatedly said that while he understood Ref A did not respond to Turkey's request for the criteria for PSI Core Group membership (Ref C), receiving such a letter after making the request was very discouraging, especially as another non-founder (Russia) that was helping Iran, that had not participated in any experts meetings, and that was contributing nothing to PSI had been brought into the group. He called this a double standard, noted that he and TGS J-5 MG Arslan were PSI's only proponents in the GOT, and stated that the lack of positive response made it impossible for them to advocate continued Turkish contribution. He said repeatedly that he would stop working on PSI until a satisfactory answer was received. We urge Washington to give careful consideration to its response to Ref C. End Summary.

NPT and Iran

[3](#). (C) On June 30, PolMilCouns and PolMilOff delivered Refs A and B to MFA DG for Disarmament Haluk Ilicak. On the NPT PrepCom, Ilicak offered his personal, preliminary views, saying that Turkey was very concerned about Iran's nuclear aspirations. Many Turks, including Ilicak, believe Iran is trying to buy time to implement a real nuclear weapons program. Turkey would support a more rigorous inspection and control regime, he said. However, he worried that the non-aligned states would strongly oppose limits on the NPT-recognized right of countries to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Ilicak did not think there could be consensus to strengthen restrictions or place limits on states in this regard during the NPT RevCon. Turkey, he said, has no nuclear aims and no nuclear program, but that it is in Turkey's interests to have strong controls. He said he would take Ref B points to his higher authorities and get a considered official response.

[4](#). (C) Returning to Iran, Ilicak warned that strong preventive measures must be taken before the Iranians develop a nuclear weapons capability, which he predicted would be developed in three-to-five years if things remain as they are. On the EU-3's initiative with the Iranians, he was skeptical and said the Europeans were driven by an interest in protecting their significant commercial ties with Iran. He worried that even if the IAEA sent the matter to the UNSC, it would be very hard to pass a resolution. He recommended that the US forestall moving the issue to the UNSC until we can assure the necessary votes for passage in the UNSC. To go to the UNSC and not get a resolution would be a disaster for the IAEA and the UNSC, he opined. In the UNSC, Ilicak continued, Iran would have the support of the non-aligned, of Russia which he said was helping Iran develop its capabilities, and of China which was involved in helping Iran with delivery systems. The EU members would continue to have

the trade consideration hanging over them. "You can be sure, Turkey is even more concerned than the US about Iran," he said.

PSI - Turkish Participation in Jeopardy

15. (C) PolMilCouns passed Ilicak Ref A letter (addressed to MFA U/S Ugur Ziyal) and made accompanying points, stressing that the latter was not/not a response to Turkey's request to become a member of the PSI Core Group. The usually stoic Ilicak became emotional asking when Turkey would get an answer and stating that given Turkey's request, the letter was very discouraging. We made clear that the same letter had been sent to over 40 PSI participants and that he should not take this as a slight toward Turkey. Ilicak continued to say that this was very disappointing, and that if Turkey was to be treated like this, it would not send representatives to experts meetings. He noted that Russia does not send personnel to PSI events or expert meetings, does not contribute planes or anything else, and was not a PSI founder. Yet they have been taken into the Core Group. This was a double standard, and Turkey wanted the status we were willing to give to at least that one other non-founder. He said he would circulate Ref A letter with a note saying that the answer to Turkey's request is no, for the time being. Until the US position changed, he said, no one in the GOT would support his pleas for more Turkish contributions. Ilicak, who clearly feels he has invested a great deal in pushing Turkey's bureaucracy to actively participate in PSI in the future, said that in all of the GOT, only he and TGS J-5 MG Arslan have supported Turkish participation.

16. (C) Ilicak said, "if you expect a positive response to future requests for contributions based on this letter, I assure you it will not serve that purpose. I am not in a position to support the continuation of our contributions." He asked again when Turkey would get a response to its request for inclusion in the Core Group. PolMilCouns said he hoped the response would come soon and that drafts were already circulation. Ilicak continued that he had prepared a matrix of relevant Turkish laws and of what Turkey could and could not do in PSI, but that he would stop moving it forward until he received a response from the US. "I'll write a report saying that while you stressed this letter is not the answer to our request, we must wait for that answer before taking any step forward. For the moment, I am not forwarding the matrix or recommending any further action. I will do everything I can to stop or slow down steps on PSI. I am really disappointed."

17. (C) Ilicak shared that NP/CBM Director Vann VanDiepen had told him during the Paris Australia Group meeting that the answer would probably be negative, but urged the Turks not to be upset and assured Ilicak that Turkey and the US could continue to work well together on PSI. Ilicak said the US would be sorry if it gave Turkey a negative answer. "It's your project. If you want us in, give us a positive response. If it is, in part, our project too, that changes our approach."

18. (C) ACTION REQUEST: Embassy requests that Washington give careful consideration to its reply to Turkey's questions (Ref C). The alternative would appear to be Turkey placing itself on the sidelines of PSI.
EDELMAN